



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BOOK REVIEWS.

NOTES ON FISKE'S "OLD VIRGINIA AND HER NEIGHBORS."

(CONTINUED.)

Miss Kate Mason Rowland, the well known authoress of the "Life of George Mason" and the "Life of Charles Carroll, of Carrollton," contributes the following notes on Prof. Fiske's "Old Virginia and her Neighbors:—"

VOLUME II, pages 170, 171.—The *Charles Carroll* who had contemplated migrating "with other (*Roman*) Catholic gentlemen" (I would always put the Roman before Catholic because that is not the only branch of the Church Catholic) to the Arkansas River was the *son* of the "agent and receiver of rents for the third Lord Baltimore." (See "Life of Charles Carroll, of Carrollton," Vol. I, pages 31, 32. This was in 1757, and the third Lord Baltimore died in 1715; his "agent" in 1720.)

VOLUME II, page 172.—It is absurd to speak of the Church of England as "a foreign and hated Church." It was the Church of Englishmen, and Marylanders were Englishmen. The Roman Catholic was really more the "foreign Church," as it was the Church of the Frenchman and the Spaniard. Irish Roman Catholics were in a minority in the Colony (page 150). If three-fourths of the Marylanders *were* "dissenters," they had just come over from England, and would hardly call her established Church "foreign," though they may not have wished to have it the established Church of Maryland, which it was. However, it would have been a very extraordinary thing to have seen (page 172) the disfranchised "Papist" making an assault upon "the poll tax for maintaining a foreign and hated Church," this being the Church of England, to which the Governor, Council and Burgesses all belonged! Or if some of the latter were "dissenters," they were as much prejudiced against the Roman Catholic Church as any members of the Establishment. (See "Life of Charles Carroll, of Carrollton," Vol. I, page 13.) Chapter 4 and Appendix A of "Life of Charles Carroll" show that the officers' fees and not the tithes of the Colony were in dispute by the "First Citizen" and Dulany. And for Charles Carroll's *professed* sentiments towards the Established Church, see page 126.

VOLUME II, page 191—"Before 1713," etc., ending with "and it is curious now to look back and think how Marlborough and Eugene at Blenheim were unconsciously *cutting out work for Grant and Sherman at Vicksburg.*"

This is a remarkable sentence to appear in a book on the South, against which Grant and Sherman waged that most wicked war of modern times! *If* these men warred against the South to free the slaves of the South,

they were violating the solemn and express provisions of their own Constitution. *If* they were fighting to force the Southern States back into the Union they were violating the principles of the Declaration of Independence, which explicitly sets forth the great right of self-government inherent in each sovereign community or State. In either case, wrong and robbery were the outcome, for which there is no possible justification.

"Always clinging to the half-savage frontier, these poor white people," etc. "Specimens of him might have been found among the border ruffians led by the savage Quantrell in 1863 to the cruel massacre at Lawrence," etc.

Now why do we hear only of "the border ruffians led by the savage Quantrell" (or Quantrill which seems to be the correct spelling of his name) and not a word is said of the *provocations* that made Quantrill so "savage," &c., of the "Jayhawkers" and their leader "Jim Lane," of whom Quantrill was in search, and of whom Quantrill said he was "the worst man that was ever born into the world"? There is no condemnation from Fiske of these Yankee "border ruffians" and their infamous chief. It is only Southern "ruffians" who point a moral with this Northern writer. Just as all their kind will expatiate upon Andersonville and keep silent about the much greater sufferings of Confederates in Northern prisons, where the ill-treatment was so great and the privations wholly needless!

VOLUME II, page 389.—Note the reference to "the iron will of Francis Preston Blair that in 1861 prevented the secessionist government of Missouri from dragging that State over to the Southern Confederacy." That statement ought to be examined. Of course the best men in Missouri were Confederates as we all know. But the North had agents there and the Federal Government did not scruple to trample upon the State Government (as in Maryland), to prevent a free exercise of the State's sovereignty. *Missouri was one of the Confederate States.* Her secession from the Union taking place *August 12, 1861.*

VOLUME II, page 395. The *Scotch-Irish*.—"When our Civil War came, these men were a great power on both sides, but the influence of the chief mass of them was exerted on the side of the Union; it held Kentucky and a large part of Tennessee, and broke Virginia in twain."

Here, I believe Prof. Fiske does great injustice to the Scotch-Irish. It was the "poor-white" element in Tennessee, as in Kentucky the ignorant—"the degraded variety or strain of the English race" (p. 320), that was disloyal to the Southern Cause—and the enlightened principles of civil liberty of which the Southern Confederacy was the exponent. See John Fox, Jr., on the mountaineers of his State, Kentucky, and their "Union" proclivities—though he is so ignorant himself as to assign the wrong reason for these proclivities. We all know what a degraded population occupied the region of east Tennessee, that was the stronghold of the "Union" sentiment in 1861–1865. I had a brother who was there

during the war—in the Confederate service—and his letters describe vividly these “degraded” Tennessee “Yankees.” As to Virginia—that part of it that the Federal Government made into a State, had sent its *best* men into the Confederate armies, and had these patriots been at home, Virginia would not have been “broken in twain.”

THE BEGINNERS OF A NATION. By Edward Eggleston.

(CONCLUDED.)

Dr. Eggleston is peculiarly at home in religious discussion. He has been a close student of religious opinion; he is by temper especially fitted to deal with these problems, and his characterizations and distinctions on this head are among the most vital and interesting in the work. His hatred of abuses springing from a too intimate union of Church and State goes far, and he glows with impatience at the lack of tolerance and of freedom in thought and opinion wherever he finds it. He rejects utterly the convention “that intolerance in the first settlers was not just like other intolerance, and that their cruelty and injustice were justifiable under the circumstances.”

If the author may be thought sometimes unjust to a people or to an age as a whole, he is never so to an individual. There are many skilful portraitures in the volume. That of Captain John Smith is distinctly good. His merits and superiority are clearly admitted; there can be no doubt of his really great qualities in controlling men and apprehending the needs of a critical situation; he is found to be exceptionally trustworthy in his geography; it is only in certain details of his narrative that Dr. Eggleston, influenced by the critics in his later study, finds the captain vulnerable. This is a distinct advance in the rehabilitation of Captain John, and indicates the marked change in the current which may perhaps go even farther, as in John Fiske's narrative. Other portrait sketches are noteworthy. The contrasts between the two Calverts in the account of the Maryland Colony, between Endecott and Winthrop, Cotton and Hooker, in Massachusetts, are admirable. Roger Williams, “the prophet of religious freedom,” is the subject of a special chapter, so important in this evolution of the life of a people are regarded the principles contended for.

Dr. Eggleston is a stylist as well as a historian, and this interest in style makes his volume all the more agreeable reading. In his own words, “I have sought to make this a work of art as well as of historical science.” Many of his sentences are sparkling, idiomatic, and flashing with point. Particularly the final sentences in his paragraphs scintillate with playful metaphor and form frequent condensed epigrammatic summaries. Illustrations abound. “It is not often that a great historical movement can be traced through a single rill to its fountain head” (page 107). “In the last years of Elizabeth, Puritanism was molting, not dying” (page 123). “Perhaps we shall be truer to the probabilities of